UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2598th MEETING: 21 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2598)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 17 June 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Botswana to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17279)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2598th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 21 June 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. D. H. N. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2598)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Letter dated 17 June 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Botswana to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17279)

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 17 June 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Botswana to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17279)

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of the Bahamas, Botswana, the German Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Seychelles, South Africa and the Sudan in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Miss Chiepe (Botswana) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Hepburn (Bahamas); Mr. Schlegel (German Democratic Republic); Mr. Makeka (Lesotho); Mr. Kofa (Liberia); Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles); Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa) and Mr. Birido (Sudan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 19 June 1985 from the Acting Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request the Security Council to permit Mr. Uddhav Deo Bhatt, Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, to participate under the provisions of rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure in the consideration of the item 'Letter dated 17 June 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Botswana to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council'".

On previous occasions the Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in a letter dated 17 June 1985 from the representative of Botswana addressed to the President of the Council [*S/17279*]. Members of the Council also have before them document S/17291, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago.

4. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/17274, letter dated 14 June 1985 from the representative of Botswana to the President of the Council; S/17278, letter dated 14 June from the representative of Zimbabwe to the President of the Council; S/17282, letter dated 17 June from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General; S/17283, letter dated 18 June from the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to the President of the Council; S/17288, letter dated 20 June from the representative of Spain to the Secretary-General; S/17289, letter dated 20 June from the representative of Italy to the Secretary-General; and S/17290, letter dated 20 June from the representative of Liberia to the President of the Council.

5. The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana, Miss Gaositwe K. T. Chiepe. I welcome her and invite her to make her statement.

6. Miss CHIEPE (Botswana): Mr. President, let me begin by acknowledging the satisfaction that derives from seeing you in the chair, a representative of Trinidad and Tobago, a country with which Botswana enjoys the most cordial relations. I must also express to you most sincerely

our gratitude for the expeditious manner in which you acceded to our request for this meeting.

7. Your predecessor performed brilliantly in the discharge of his onerous responsibilities as President of the Council for the month of May. We extend to him our sincere congratulations.

8. The case we have brought to the Council is a simple one, though tragic. The world already knows that on Friday, 14 June 1985, at 0140 hours, the peaceful capital of my country, Botswana, was invaded by South African commandos who murdered in cold blood, in their sleep, six South African refugees, two residents, two visitors, one of whom was a six-year-old child from Lesotho, and two Botswana nationals. The invasion was unprovoked and unwarranted. It was the culmination of a progressively aggressive South African attitude towards my country, an attitude that has deteriorated as the agitation for change has intensified inside South Africa.

9. Botswana and South Africa have always coexisted in peace, despite their conflicting philosophies of life. My people abhor without reservation the evil policy of *apartheid* and the rabid racism that feeds and sustains it, but they are realistic enough to appreciate that they and the people of South Africa have been thrown together by fate to share space in the part of the African subcontinent they presently occupy, and will always occupy. They have to live together in peace, or they will perish together in conflict. That is why my country has never allowed its very determined opposition to *apartheid* to undermine its commitment to the principle of peaceful coexistence. Our fidelity to this principle is unquestionable, our determination to uphold it sacrosanct.

10. This is so despite the fact that South Africa has, in the past two years, continuously insisted that we sign with it a non-aggression pact, as if our country is capable of committing an act or acts of aggression against so deadly powerful a neighbour. My country has constantly refused to sign such a pact. We would be mad even to imagine that we could attack South Africa. Botswana is a peace-loving country whose only desire is to develop economically and coexist peacefully with all its neighbours.

11. We have repeatedly argued that the signing of a so-called non-aggression pact with South Africa would, in addition to compromising our sovereignty, serve no useful purpose, since a mere signature cannot enhance our capacity to be more vigilant than we are now against guerrilla infiltration into South Africa. If South Africa itself, with all the overwhelming resources at its command, is incapable—as is obviously the case—of sealing its borders against infiltration, how much more so of our small country, with meagre resources?

12. Our country has always been punctiliously scrupulous in honouring its word. The truth is that we have never allowed, can never allow and will never allow our vulnerable country to be used as a base for guerrilla operations against South Africa. That is why the South African commandos found not one military camp or centre on their arrival in our capital on that fateful Friday morning, but a peaceful, even placid town, in bed, fast asleep. It has been the sacrosanct policy of the Botswana Government since independence never to permit the presence in our country of instruments of war intended to be employed against any of our neighbours. That we have apprehended, tried publicly in our courts of law and imprisoned or deported all those we come into contact with who carry weapons of war bears more than ample testimony to our adherence and commitment to the inviolability of our policy.

13. However, in fulfilment of our statutory obligations as a State party to the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees signed at Geneva in 1951[1] and the Convention of the Organization of African Unity Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa concluded at Addis Ababa in 1969[2], and as a humanitarian and moral obligation and duty, we do give political asylum to refugees fleeing the persecution and the brutalities that result from the inhumanities of *apartheid* in South Africa. This we will do, regardless of the consequences, for we are a freedom-loving people and country. It would be morally repugnant to us to deny hospitality to our fellow men in their flight from racial tyranny.

14. The train of developments leading to the Friday aggression against our capital is an uncomplicated one. Having failed to get us to sign a non-aggression pact whose utility could be best known to and appreciated by South Africa, in January of this year the rulers of South Africa, through the bantustan of Bophuthatswana, issued an unveiled threat that unless Botswana stopped allowing its territory to be used as a launching pad to attack South Africa, South Africa would invade Botswana and take retaliatory action. When we publicized that threat, the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs Mr. Botha, denied that it had been issued by his country and said he had simply reported what he had been told by Bophuthatswana. For our part, we reminded South Africa of our well-known policy regarding the regime that governs the presence of refugees in our country.

15. At the request of the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs, a meeting was arranged for 22 February 1985 between him and myself. In the meantime, on 13 February, nine days before the meeting was to take place, a bomb blasted a house in Gaborone, our capital, in which some South African refugees lived. Miraculously, the occupants escaped unhurt. On 22 February the two sides met and had full and frank discussions on the state of relations between our two countries. Botswana once again explained at length why it refused to sign a non-aggression pact. We argued that, since it was neither our intention to launch an attack against South Africa nor did we have the capacity to do so, we saw no reason why we should sign a non-aggression pact with South Africa. We harboured no warlike intentions or ambitions towards South Africa, for that would be sheer madness on our part, as we had repeatedly stated.

16. In answer to the hackneyed South African staple charge that freedom fighters use our country to infiltrate

South Africa, we argued that, just as South Africa neither allowed its nationals to leave their country as refugees nor allowed them back in as so-called terrorists, but that they constantly eluded it, despite that country's highly sophisticated and practically unlimited intelligence-gathering capacity and over-abundant material, financial and human resources, Botswana cannot be blamed when the same people occasionally elude us and cross into and attack South Africa. We reminded Mr. Botha of the case of two British tourists who had a few days earlier been murdered in Mozambique by people who had crossed into Mozambique from South Africa and returned to that country after committing the murder. We asked him if South Africa were to blame for allowing them to commit the murder. Mr. Botha agreed that a Government could not be blamed for acts of terrorism perpetrated in such circumstances. In keeping with our well-known policy and tradition of honesty and fair-mindedness, we have always asked the South Africans to give us timely warning whenever they knew of incidents which needed to be followed up quickly. We reminded Mr. Botha of that tradition at the meeting of 22 February.

17. We did not agree on everything; we did not solve everything. But the meeting ended amicably with the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs assuring us that South Africa fully believed what we had said and therefore would not again ask us to sign any agreement. He also assured us that South Africa would no longer block our economic projects, which they had attempted to link to the signing of a non-aggression pact, in contravention of the terms of the Customs Union Agreement to which both our countries belong. Mr. Botha then announced to the world that our meeting had been so fruitful that Botswana would no longer be pressed by South Africa to sign a non-aggression pact.

18. The sense of relief we felt can be imagined. We went back to Botswana with a sense of achievement, and I was able to say the following to the Botswana Parliament:

> "I am pleased to inform honourable members that, after difficult negotiations lasting more than a year, during which South Africa pressed Botswana to sign a non-aggression accord with it, the South African Government has finally accepted our stand and publicly announced that there is no need for Botswana and South Africa to sign an accord. It is my hope that this particular chapter in our relations with South Africa is now closed and never to be reopened."

19. We were pleased with what appeared to us to be a clear signal of the end of the inexplicable nastiness of Pretoria's attitude towards our country, but not naive enough to believe that all would henceforth be plain sailing. We could never be lulled into believing that we had suddenly earned the unquestioning respect and trust of a self-appointed regional Power accustomed to bullying its weak neighbours. We expected more bullying and arm-twisting in some other direction, but not what happened on Friday, 14 June.

20. On Tuesday, 14 May, at around 1000 hours, a car belonging to a South African refugee parked outside a block of flats adjacent to a primary school blew up as the owner tried to start it. Needless to say, the hapless refugee was blown to smithereens. Had he started the car earlier, when schoolchildren were filing in and workers going to work, innocent schoolchildren, Botswana citizens and foreign nationals would have been maimed or killed. The perpetrators of those ghastly atrocities have now revealed themselves.

21. During the week beginning 3 June, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa suggested that we have a meeting either on 26 June or 2 July. His office was informed that I was away and owing to standing commitments could not meet him before 23 July. In the small hours of 14 June, South African commandos raided our capital, and later the same morning of 14 June, before we could recover from the shock of the early morning's carnage, Mr. Botha sent a telex to my office accepting 23 July as suitable for a meeting.

22. If this is not a Jekyl and Hyde situation, it is difficult to imagine one, when a responsible Minister can appear to want to discuss issues of mutual interest while at the same time he plans and executes the most cold-blooded terrorism with mathematical precision. Is the meeting being called just to replay the televised wanton destruction, accompanied by the display of sadistic pleasure at the fantastic and intoxicating success of the operation? Or is it to deliver another foretaste of things to come when South African commandos will once more strike Botswana with ruthless efficiency? The warning has been given in no uncertain terms. The South African newspapers, led by the Government-supported *The Citizen*, radio and television, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Chief of the Army are beside themselves with the sheet delight they have derived from the whole sordid affair.

23. The excuse given by South Africa is that the recent attempt in Cape Town on the lives of two Coloured members of parliament was planned and executed from Gaborone, and it was the last straw for the South African Government.

24. Since Cape Town is about 2,000 kilometres from Gaborone, our capital, several questions arise in one's mind. In view of South Africa's sophisticated intelligence, communications and other resources, why did they not intercept and/or forestall the operation? Was it because the Government of South Africa wanted the operation to succeed in order to use the assassination of the Coloured MPs to strengthen Pretoria's war against the ANC (*African National Congress of South Africa*)? Was it in order to portray Botswana as an unsafe country, the centre of guerrilla activity, and frighten prospective investors away from it? Did South Africa allow it to happen in order to have a pretext to launch an attack on a peace-loving neighbouring country?

25. Yes, more nagging questions. If the real reason for the brutal attack on our small defenceless capital was to flush out ANC nerve centres, as was the reason given for the aborted raid on the Cabinda oil complex a few weeks ago, then, first, would every house in which a refugee lived be a nerve centre? Secondly, could that justify the shoot-

ing, point blank, of a frightened, fleeing six-year-old child? Thirdly, did they have to shoot a Dutch couple because they lived in a house that had been vacated by the ANC refugees a month earlier? They should have known this, since they claim to know everything that takes place in the houses which they attacked on 14 June. Fourthly, why did they murder two Botswana women who had absolutely nothing to do with the ANC? Fifthly, why did they shoot at Botswanas going to their homes from a dinner at a hotel?

26. Let us look at the particulars of the victims of the Friday attack to see if there is any truth to Pretoria's charge that they were guerrillas planning military attacks against South Africa from our capital.

27. The murdered "ANC guerrillas" were: a 60-year-old man who emigrated from South Africa in the early 1950s, the holder of a residence permit that was to expire in December this year; a 71-year-old man who came to Botswana in 1981 to spend the remaining days of his waning life in peace and freedom in exile; a 47-year-old businessman and his social-worker wife who worked for our Ministry of Local Government and Lands; a student at the University of Botswana; a Dutch national of Somali origin who worked for a data-processing company and may never have heard of the ANC; a musician; a teacher at one of our secondary schools; a young visitor who had been a student in South Africa; two young Botswana housekeepers, who very likely had never heard of the ANC; and, worst of all, a six-year-old child who, as I said earlier, had been shot to death fleeing for his dear life. The six wounded are: a Dutch national who, like her Somali husband murdered in the raid, is not even remotely connected to the ANC; two innocent Botswana who were shot going about their own business in their own home town and country; and three refugees, one of whom was a 15-year-old dependent of a refugee.

28. These are the so-called guerrillas of the ANC—all, including the six-year-old, who were said to be the masterminds of the raging revolution in South Africa. Now let us look at the geographical location in our capital of the houses they occupied.

29. Gaborone is a free and open city accessible to visitors, including South Africans, who require no visa to enter our country. The city is only 12 kilometres from our common border with South Africa and is the location of a popular Southern Sun casino hotel heavily patronized by South Africans of all colours and races in search particularly of a weekend of non-racial freedom. These fun-seeking, freedom-hungry victims of the Group Areas Act and Immorality Act—the latter now abolished—are free to walk the streets of our capital, visit their friends in its suburbs and go anywhere they like.

30. This is also a small city described so aptly by the London *Observer* Sunday last as being "the size of an English market town, the kind of place where everybody knows everybody else"—indeed, the kind of place where not even one guerrilla can hide without being discovered in no time, let alone so many living publicly in our midst. The so-called ANC guerrillas lived all over town because the houses they occupied were located all over town. These were refugees who could not be moved to the refugee centre, called Dukwe, in the north because they were in established employment; and so they lived peacefully with their families in ordinary houses mostly rented from the Botswana Housing Corporation. Some in fact lived even closer to the South African border, in a village adjoining Gaborone, a village traversed by a popular highway to South Africa—yes, next to a popular road to South Africa. Even there the South African commandos murdered some of what they called ANC guerrillas and two of our nationals.

31. But even more fantastic is the fact that one of the murdered "ANC guerrillas" occupied a house that was sandwiched between two houses owned by two members of the Botswana police, the same police whom refugees should dread if they had anything to hide, such as the planning from our soil of military attacks against South Africa. How could they have engaged in guerrilla activities against South Africa in that kind of location without being discovered?

32. All the houses attacked by the South African commandos were scattered all over the city. They were well known to everybody, including our police, and, as it has turned out, even to South Africa itself. They could not by any stretch of the imagination be used as guerrilla bases or nerve centres and fail to attract the vigilance of our police force. Inspection of what remains of the destroyed houses has turned up no evidence that the houses had ever been used, as charged by Mr. Botha: no caches of weapons, other than the two suspicious pieces given to the press—the pieces could simply have come from South Africa's own arsenal to try to prove a very difficult point—were found; no dramatic, staged display of morning-after loot in Pretoria and Cape Town. There was, on the contrary, overwhelming evidence that the murdered refugees had been nothing but peaceable civilian refugees who had been so nonchalant about their innocent stay in Botswana that they did not even have a knife to defend themselves with when they were shot in their sleep.

33. Permit me at this stage to comment on some of the specific allegations, the facts and the fiction, contained in the press statement made on 14 June by Mr. Botha. I shall comment only on those I have not already touched on.

34. In the second paragraph of Mr. Botha's statement it is stated that my predecessor, Mr. Archie Mogwe, was given a list at a meeting held on 21 April 1983 at Jan Smuts Airport, Johannesburg, containing names of "terrorists in Botswana together with an indication of their active participation in the planning and intended execution of violence in South Africa" [*see S/17282, annex*]. Yes, the list was given to him and the allegations were thoroughly investigated. It turned out that the so-called terrorists were ordinary refugees who had never violated the legal régime which governs their stay in our country and their recognition as refugees. Most of them were not even in Botswana at the time, having left our country some time earlier to seek safer refuge abroad. Thus, we could not take action

against innocent refugees legally resident in our country, strictly abiding by the laws which govern them, or against people who had left the country.

35. Mr. Botha speaks at length in his statement about several meetings held in the course of 1984 between Botswana and South African officials aimed at reaching an agreement on "appropriate measures" to be taken "to prevent the planning and execution of acts of violence, sabotage and terrorism against each other" [*ibid.*]. This is clearly a nostalgic reference to the long series of meetings we had with South Africa on the signing of a non-aggression pact. Mr. Botha knows that Botswana has always co-operated with his country on matters of common security. We have done so without the encumbrances of a meaningless formal treaty, so the measures he is referring to have always been there. That is why we have arrested, charged, imprisoned and deported those who have violated our policy of not allowing them to operate from our country.

36. There is, of course, a presumption in Mr. Botha's statement which must be rejected with the contempt it deserves. This presumption is that but for the intransigence of the political side of the Botswana Government our security services would have signed some non-aggression pact "because of a realization on their part of the destabilizing effect of the growing ANC presence in Botswana" [*ibid.*]. This is a fabrication. No part of the Botswana Government has ever felt that a solution to the problem of security along our common border with South Africa lies in the signing of a non-aggression pact; the contrary is true.

37. Mr. Botha further lays great stress on what he calls repeated warnings by his Government about "ANC terrorist activities" in Botswana. He admits having threatened in January to invade Botswana if we continued to allow the ANC to use it as an "infiltration route to South Africa". What Mr. Botha cannot admit is that in all these charges he has rarely given us proof or evidence that the ANC is indeed doing from our territory what he says they are doing. All we are given are often nebulous vituperative statements of charges based on mere suspicion, or simply deliberate fabrications designed to force us to get rid of genuine refugees. Mr. Botha knows that whenever we are given facts we follow them up until we are satisfied that indeed no one is breaking our laws by using our country as an "infiltration route to South Africa". The facts are there for anybody to see.

38. But South Africa will be asking for the impossible if its new policy is that no country in its neighbourhood should act as host to refugees from South Africa and that we should all treat victims of ***apartheid*** and racial tyranny as enemies of "regional stability" and peace and accept the cynical view that the most dangerous "terrorist" is a South African refugee who lives in Gaborone, Maseru, Mbabane, Maputo or Harare and who keeps crossing into South Africa clandestinely to spit his venom there. Our very humanity, our sense of morality, the international legal instruments relating to refugees to which we are party and our love of freedom as a people will never allow us to bar our doors against victims of political circumstances.

39. But all this is most irrelevant, for the undebatable issue is that South Africa has violated the territorial integrity of my country with the impunity of a modern scientific Goliath. And why has it done so? Botswana is not responsible for the crimes committed inside South Africa by the policies of ***apartheid*** or by those who enforce them. We are not responsible for the mounting upheaval in that country. South Africa, and only South Africa, is responsible.

40. We have long warned that the pestilence of racism will consume all of us in the region if it is allowed to go on unchecked; no commando raids against the front-line States will bring South Africa, or the region as a whole, nearer to salvation. Salvation lies solely in putting an end once for all to the brutalities of ***apartheid*** in South Africa so that there will be no more Sowetos, Uitenhages, Sharpevilles, Langas and the rest, no more refugees scattered all over the sub-continent and the world at large raring to return to their country at all costs.

41. The ANC, the dreaded scourge of white minority rule in South Africa, would not need to resort to armed struggle as an instrument with which it seeks to pry open the barred doors of freedom if the movement were allowed to operate freely and to articulate without fear of persecution the frustrated aspirations of a black South Africa that has been wallowing in misery for so long.

42. For my people in their hour of crisis and tragedy I ask of the Council nothing more or less than the strongest possible condemnation, unequivocally expressed, of South Africa's brutal terrorism perpetrated against our capital and against refugees given refuge in our country. I appeal to the Council to demand that South Africa desist from further acts of terrorism against Botswana and abandon its planned attack on our country. I appeal to the Council and to the international community to find ways of ensuring security in our region. I request the Council to dispatch a mission to see and assess on its behalf the damage caused and to examine the question of possible assistance.

43. Let me end by assuring the Council that we will never give up our values. As the President of Botswana said on Saturday,

> "Botswana will neither waver nor compromise its principled position of safeguarding innocent lives that are jeopardized and of providing a sanctuary for refugees. It is not possible, in spite of all the military power South Africa possesses and may unleash upon us, to destroy our belief in the rule of law, our traditions, our customs and our civilization."

That is our fundamental promise to the Council.

44. Mr. VERMA (India): It is with pleasure, Sir, that we express once again our satisfaction at seeing you in the Chair.

45. We are meeting today to consider the dastardly military attack, a week ago, by forces of the racist Pretoria régime on Gaborone, the capital of Botswana. That attack

constitutes the latest entry in the grisly catalogue of South Africa's crimes against its independent African neighbours. The cowardly and brutal assault, under cover of darkness, on innocent men, women and children, most of them murdered in their beds, was indeed true to Pretoria's style. No scruples appear to inhibit the racist régime from spilling innocent blood, whether within its own borders or elsewhere in the entire region that is victim of its terror and intimidation.

46. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana apprised the Council this morning of the details of the latest act of aggression perpetrated by the forces of the racist régime against Botswana and the loss of human life and material damage inflicted as a result. There can be little doubt that South Africa's action has been unprovoked, unjustified, premeditated and cold-blooded, that it is in complete contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, and that it is in violation of United Nations resolutions. It is an action that evokes our strongest condemnation.

47. The Government of India issued the following statement on 18 June 1985:

> "The Government of India have learnt of the unwarranted and unprovoked attack made by the racist South African régime on civilians residing in Botswana which has resulted in the loss of several lives. This is the latest in a series of brutal incidents caused by the racist régime, which has shown no respect for the territorial integrity or sovereignty of States which are its neighbours. The savage killing of these people living in Botswana, a country which has given repeated assurances of not permitting its territory to be used for launching attacks on neighbouring countries, shows yet again that the racist South African régime is willing to flagrantly violate all laws of civilized behaviour. The Government of India strongly condemns the racist South African régime for perpetrating this outrage, which is part of its continuing pattern of aggressive and unlawful behaviour towards its smaller and weaker neighbours. The Government of India also offers its profound sympathies to the Government of Botswana and to the relatives of the deceased."

48. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, in its Political Declaration,

> "noted with great concern the increased acts of military, political and economic destabilization perpetrated by the South African racist régime against the independent neighbouring States . . . [including] Botswana" [*S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 60*].

The Conference further:

> "commended the front-line States and other neighbouring States for their courage and determination in the face of brazen intimidation by South Africa and called upon the world community to provide all possible assistance and support to these countries to strengthen their defences as well as to create conditions to avert bloodshed in the whole of southern Africa." [*Ibid., para. 68.*]

49. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries stands by Botswana, a peace-loving, non-aligned country, in its hour of travail. We assure the Government of Botswana of our continuing solidarity and support.

50. Pretoria has once again put forward the familiar argument seeking to justify its action in terms of the defence of its own security. The statement of 14 June by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the racist régime reads:

> "The South African security forces had no alternative but to protect South Africa and its people from the increasing number of terrorist attacks emanating from Botswana. . . .
>
> "It is an established principle of international law that a State may not permit on its territory activities for the purpose of carrying out acts of violence on the territory of another State. It is equally well established that a State has a right to take appropriate steps to protect its own security and territorial integrity against such acts." [*see S/17282, annex.*]

Such references to international law sound strange coming from a régime that makes a mockery of law and, indeed, of the elementary norms of civilized behaviour.

51. The threat to the *apartheid* régime stems not from peace-loving and law-abiding Botswana or Angola, or any other State for that matter; that threat is rooted within South Africa itself, embodied in the odious system of *apartheid*. That system eats at its own vitals and is responsible for all the tension and instability that afflict southern Africa. Pretoria's forays against its smaller, weaker neighbours and its killing of defenceless people are merely part of its attempts to place its own crimes at somebody else's door. The Council must recognize that fact and act accordingly.

52. Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): I listened carefully and with profound sympathy to the moving and eloquent statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana this morning. I am sure other members of the Council were similarly impressed.

53. It is an extraordinary and, perhaps, unprecedented state of affairs that the Council should today be entering its third separate debate within a single week on the actions of one Member State. This, of itself, is a fact of which all the people of South Africa should take note. Though I appreciate the presence here today of the representative of South Africa and will listen carefully to what he has to say this afternoon, I regret that his Government all too often gives the impression that it does not wish to take account of the very serious proceedings of the Council. It would be most unwise for the South African Govern-

ment to ignore the views expressed and the resolutions adopted here.

54. I need not rehearse the events which took place in the capital city of Botswana in the early hours of 14 June; they have been fully and faithfully described to us. Nor do I wish to repeat the remarks which I made about the attack on Gaborone in my statement to the Council on that same day [*2590th meeting*]. I have asked to speak, however, because I wish to make emphatically clear at the beginning of this debate that the British Government regards the explanations which the Government of South Africa has sought to make since 14 June as entirely unsatisfactory and in no way justifying the violation of sovereignty and the killing or wounding of innocent people.

55. The United Kingdom is not blind to the complexities of the internal situation in South Africa and to the tension in that unhappy country. The United Kingdom is utterly opposed to the use of violence and to acts of assassination. But, in South Africa's own best interests, as well as in the interests of all neighbouring countries, the South African Government must come to recognize that a solution to its internal problems will never be found by attacking neighbouring countries. It is for the people of South Africa—all the people of South Africa, of whatever race or colour—to resolve their own future. It is within South Africa, not outside, that *apartheid* must be completely dismantled and that different groups and races must learn to live together in justice and equity and with full respect for the rights of each individual—and that will happen sooner or later.

56. As the Council knows, the British Government has expressed its views on the attack on Gaborone to the Government of South Africa in the strongest possible terms. The Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Sir Geoffrey Howe, has condemned the violation of Botswana's sovereignty and deplored South Africa's act of violence. He has left the South African Government in no doubt that we regard the attack as utterly indefensible.

57. We have at the same time kept in the closest possible contact with the Government of Botswana, and have offered our support. The relationship between Britain and Botswana, as fellow members of the Commonwealth, could not be warmer or more extensive, and I am delighted today to renew our offer of assistance to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana. Her country, as I said on 14 June, threatens no one and has not the slightest intention of attacking anyone. Botswana has lived in peace and democracy since independence. The way in which Botswana has coped with the burdens of geography and of nature and with conflict and turbulence in neighbouring States has attracted universal admiration.

58. In attacking Gaborone, South Africa has made an incomprehensible as well as a tragic error. Is it too much to hope that the South African Government will itself acknowledge this, and will at once repair the enormous harm it has done? Is it too much to hope that South Africa will desist henceforth from cross-border violence, recognizing that it enjoys not a vestige of support in the international community for such actions?

59. I trust that the South African representative will at once convey the strength of our feelings to his Government, and will persuade it to answer these questions in the only acceptable way. In the meantime, I hope that Botswana's many friends will join in providing all possible assistance and that the Council will take a clear and unanimous decision today.

60. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): As the representative of the United Kingdom said at the beginning of his statement, the Council is meeting to consider a third complaint within a week against the racist Pretoria Government, which has persisted in committing illegal acts and in its aggression against neighbouring States. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana has unequivocally explained all the facts.

61. It is ironic that the racist Pretoria régime should call on a peace-loving, peaceful State such as Botswana, which has no army, to enter into a so-called non-aggression pact. The recent aggression against Botswana was committed after a series of threats, which culminated in the perpetration of a deliberate, abominable act that can in no way be justified or explained. We listened attentively to details of the scope of that act of aggression, the deep psychological effects and the loss of life and property, as described by the Foreign Minister of Botswana.

62. Once again within a week, we are forced to repeat that the situation requires the Council to apply the measures provided by the Charter of the United Nations in order to deter the racist régime. Egypt reiterates that it is ready to go all the way with the Council, including the application of measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

63. Yesterday the representative of the Government of South Africa arrogantly told the Council of the conditions that the racist régime seeks to impose on its neighbours in so-called peaceful coexistence. Those words deceive no one. Moreover, in persisting in violating Council resolutions, South Africa claims for itself the right to call its acts of aggression "hot pursuit".

64. We have often discussed the acts of the racist Government of Pretoria. We hope that today the Council will face the deteriorating situation with the necessary firmness.

65. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Bahamas, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States for the month of June. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

66. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): Statistics support the view that the month of June is the luckiest for men, because that is the period when most are chosen as husbands. For a slightly different reason, I shall have to adopt

June as my lucky month, having for the second time in as many days had the honour to address the Council in this Chamber. Who knows? Today is only 21 June, and, given the state of affairs among nations on this civilized planet on which we live, I may break yet another record.

67. The words "luck" and "civilized", despite the frivolity and facetiousness their use may convey, are not cited merely for levity, but to bring out the gravity and seriousness of the issue before us, so ably expressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana. We may say, on the one hand, that the people of Botswana had bad luck on 14 June and, on the other, that the Government of South Africa used civilized weapons to execute its nefarious plan. The response by the Government of Botswana to the attack once again underscores a fundamental virtue inherent in persecuted people—the ability to persevere. Perseverance in this context is the reverse of subjugation or fatalism, and it is for that spirit of patience and determination that we commend the black majority of South Africa and, indeed, abused people everywhere.

68. By no stretch of the imagination could the United Nations be called fledgling. Of course, maturity need not be synonymous with age, but it can be assumed that the Organization, which will be 40 years old in October, has in that period of time experienced, in one form or another, every international catastrophe. Time has shown that, no matter how incensed or elated representatives might feel about an issue, they could only rehash the old facts in a new way, and that not very often. Similarly, the matter before us is not a new one, but it augurs well for this body that, rather than the matter's being shelved, it is being recycled with the hope that the spin-off may be put to some other useful advantage.

69. The South African Government's installation of an interim government in Windhoek, its violation of the human rights of the people of Soweto, its disregard for the territorial integrity of Angola and now the attack on the capital of Botswana are clear signs that the Pretoria régime cannot be coaxed into peaceful change.

70. The oppressed people of the African continent and, indeed, rational human beings everywhere, must be asking: if such atrocities and unilateral decisions persist, irrespective of genuine efforts being made by the international community to achieve a fair, lasting and non-violent solution, what can be the next step? Are the people of Botswana to accept these attacks as a *fait accompli*? Are families to live in constant fear for their lives and property? Are human beings to be subjected forever to invasion of privacy and loss of integrity because of the colour of their skin?

71. These may seem like general, hypothetical and melodramatic queries, but they go to the core of the problem before us today. Under the Pretoria régime, for instance, black South Africans have no freedom. They have no legal, political, social or economic rights, because the policy of *apartheid* strips them of their reason for being. The law reinforces double or even triple standards. The cosmetic changes that the South African Government has brought into force uphold the sentiment just expressed. It is a simple fact. The black majority have no role to play in the system, either for themselves or for their country. Their contribution must be made through subservience and deprivation. Is it any wonder, then, that raids like the one perpetrated against the people of Botswana can be carried out with such impunity?

72. We in the Latin American and Caribbean region feel a sense of indignation as well as a sense of helplessness. We speak here today because we are convinced that unity is strength. We believe in the interdependence of all States and the significance of carrying one another's burdens. Above all, we believe in the sanctity of human lives and the importance of justice.

73. We share in the sorrow that the bereaved families must feel. We sympathize with the Government of Botswana, which, besides being frustrated, must harbour anger, anxiety and fear of further aggression by South Africa's commandos.

74. We in the Latin American and Caribbean region welcome this occasion to reiterate our condemnation of all acts of aggression, and in particular, the current attack made against the people of the sovereign State of Botswana. We reject the reasons given as unjustifiable, especially since there have been mutual expressions of willingness to negotiate and to seek the best methods of finding a just solution. We are concerned that the meaning and value of trust is diminishing and that the South African Government will continue to make unilateral decisions that cannot help but endanger the concept of international peace and security. There is no doubt, then, that the South African Government deserves the strongest condemnation by the Council.

75. On behalf of the Member States of Latin America and the Caribbean, I would wish the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana to express our sincere condolences to the families of the victims and to assure the Government and the people of her country that we shall continue to support the struggle for justice and freedom and work with all peace-loving nations for the promotion and implementation of good-neighbourliness, interdependence and self-determination.

76. Mr. GRUNNET (Denmark): On the morning of 14 June, South African troops once more violated the borders of a neighbouring country spreading death and destruction, this time in an attack against Botswana's capital. Among the many victims were both South African refugees and citizens of Botswana. South Africa's attack was particularly repugnant because it was directed against a peace-loving country which has the policy not to allow its territory to be used as a springboard for attacks against any of its neighbours, including South Africa.

77. The attack was also a deliberate and highly provocative act. The South African Government has openly stated that the attack was carried out after careful deliberations

and after calculating the effect it would have on the international community. It confirmed that South Africa was hypocritical when it declared its willingness to co-operate with neighbouring countries in controlling cross-border violence and settle problems by peaceful means.

78. The news about South Africa's latest and blatant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a neighbouring country was received with a profound sense of horror and deep shock in the international community.

79. The Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs has expressed the strongest condemnation of this new example of South Africa's reckless conduct. Furthermore, he deeply deplored that the inhuman *apartheid* régime in Pretoria once more had demonstrated that it does not refrain from violating even the most fundamental principles of international law in its endeavours to suppress the black majority in South Africa and its representatives.

80. It has by now become abundantly clear that South Africa has little intention of ending its military and political aggression against the front-line States and that South Africa is totally indifferent to its moral standing in the eyes of the international community. This state of affairs is becoming increasingly unacceptable. South Africa must be brought to understand that it cannot continue with impunity to violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring States.

81. In the Council, Denmark has consistently argued in favour of unanimity with respect to South Africa's *apartheid* policy and other violations of human rights, its conduct on the Namibia question and its aggression against neighbouring States. To us, the South African attack on Botswana underlines the necessity of a unanimous decision by the Council.

82. The members of the Council have to co-operate in a spirit of compromise in order to reach agreement on measures against South Africa which can in an effective way increase and sustain an international pressure directed against the totally unacceptable conduct and policy of South Africa.

83. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): The Australian delegation listened this morning to the poignant and detailed statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana with genuine feelings of sorrow and respect—sorrow that a peaceful country should be so abused by its larger neighbour and respect for its unprovocative humanitarian and principled policies towards its neighbours, which the Minister so eloquently described.

84. It was with a sense of frustration and deep concern that the Australian Government learned of the armed incursion by South African forces into Botswana on the night of 13/14 June.

85. Botswana, a fellow member of the Commonwealth, is a country with which Australia has warm and friendly relations. As one of the front-line States, Botswana has in recent years had to pay a heavy price for its geography and for its humanity in dealing with refugee problems posed by the policies of South Africa in Angola, Namibia and in South Africa itself.

86. Botswana's is a voice which is widely respected in the United Nations, in the Commonwealth and in Africa. Botswana has never attacked any neighbouring country and, as the representative of Botswana reminded us this morning, does not represent any threat to any of its neighbours. Yet it has been the subject of a brutal and cowardly incursion by South Africa against which it has little capacity to retaliate. The international community has a responsibility to condemn South Africa for its actions in Botswana and to do all that it can to ensure that such actions do not recur.

87. It is inevitable that after the exhaustive debates of the last weeks on developments in Namibia and Angola, our statements will have a sense of *déjà vu*. It is important, however, that notwithstanding the coincidence of three consecutive Council debates, the issues be stated clearly and unequivocally in response to these specific situations. This has been done in the cases of Namibia and Angola through the adoption of resolutions 566 (1985) and 567 (1985), and it will again, we trust, be done through the adoption of the draft resolution before us dealing specifically with Botswana.

88. South Africa's armed incursion was strongly condemned in a statement issued on behalf of the Australian Government by the Deputy Prime Minister and Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Lionel Bowen, on 16 June, and the concern of the Australian Government was strongly registered with the South African Government through the South African Ambassador in Canberra.

89. South Africa's incursion represented a blatant breach of international law and underlined a complete disregard for Botswana's sovereignty. It was clear that the raid had been carried out with premeditated violence and without concern for the rights and safety of the people of Gaborone.

90. South Africa's actions were particularly deplorable because they took place at a time when Botswana and South Africa were holding talks on security measures.

91. Australia does not condone the use of violence to settle problems. South Africa's actions in Botswana, as indeed its recent actions in relation to Angola and Namibia, deserve the strongest condemnation of the international community. As other representatives have pointed out this morning, it would be in South Africa's own interests to respond to the increasing frustration and anger of the international community and abandon its illegal and dangerous policies of seeking to destabilize its neighbours.

92. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): For the second time this week we are meeting to consider a complaint by a neighbouring State of South Africa that has been a victim of an unprovoked attack. As soon as we

heard the news, on 14 June, of the death-dealing raid perpetrated against the capital of Botswana, France unequivocally condemned that violation of the territory of a sovereign, independent country in flagrant disregard of international law. The very next day, the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs convoked the Ambassador of South Africa to France to reiterate that condemnation.

93. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana has come here to describe to us the events that led to the convening of the Council. We listened with keen attention to her particularly eloquent statement. At least 12 persons died and several others were wounded in the course of the raid by the South African forces. Among the victims are women and children. I respectfully request the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana to convey to the families of the victims the deepest condolences of the French Government and my delegation.

94. The incursion perpetrated last week in Gaborone at the very moment the Council was meeting to remind South Africa of its international commitments regarding Namibian independence has served to remind us that the problems of southern Africa are closely interconnected. It is because of the welcome that has been granted South African refugees victims of *apartheid* that South Africa has struck Botswana, just as it struck Lesotho in December 1982 and Mozambique in 1983. How can one ignore the implications of such defiance?

95. None of the problems of southern Africa can be solved by violence. Armed actions perpetrated in cross-border violence can in no way mitigate the internal tensions caused by the policy of *apartheid*.

96. Several States of the region have demonstrated that they are ready to talk. South Africa showed respond in good faith to their opening and commit itself to the path of pacification. It has everything to gain by doing so, and a great deal to lose by not doing so.

97. France stands in solidarity with Botswana and its people in the present difficulties. We have no doubt whatsoever that the Security Council will demonstrate the support the international community should give this worthy nation, which simply wishes to live in peace.

98. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned members of the Council.

99. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): For the last two weeks, the Council has, for all practical purposes, been considering uninterruptedly various aspects of the dangerous situation in the southern part of the African continent as a result of the aggressive actions of the racist South African régime. Another victim of that aggressive policy, and not for the first time, is the sovereign, independent non-aligned State of Botswana.

100. The facts put forward in the statement made today by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Botswana speak for themselves and are unlikely to cause any doubts in the mind of anyone present here in the Council chamber. We are talking about an act of aggression carefully planned and carried out in cold blood. We are also talking about a violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that African country.

101. As a result of the bandit-like raid by the racists on the capital of Botswana on 14 June, 12 peaceable people died, including a six-year-old child, and significant material damage was caused.

102. In recent years, Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho and the Seychelles have been victims of the international lawlessness of the racist Pretoria régime. The international community has repeatedly characterized the aggressive acts of Pretoria as a serious threat to international peace and security, and has condemned them. The most recent such condemnation came from the Council just yesterday. Clearly, the aggressive policy of South Africa with regard to African countries represents an ever-growing threat to the peoples of southern Africa and to the security not just of that region but of areas beyond it. It is also quite clear that recent events in Botswana and Angola are not isolated incidents; they are inseparable parts of the South African policy of force and pressure, of destabilization and terrorism against sovereign States of Africa—a policy of maintaining the criminal system of *apartheid* at any cost.

103. The ruling circles of South Africa are virtually boasting of openly ignoring the decisions of the Council. They have come to believe in the impunity of their aggressive actions because they can count on support from the Western Powers. They know that when it comes to a vote, the Western Powers block the adoption of effective measures against the South African régime and protect it from the application of international sanctions.

104. In these terms it is indicative that, right after the bandit-like raid on Gaborone, the commander of the South African forces who planned and carried out that shameful action stated, with the directness of a mindlessly obedient soldier: "We plan, if necessary, to carry out further operations of this sort in Botswana or anywhere else". Echoing him, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the racist régime, Mr. Botha, made threats against the United Nations right after the Gaborone raid. He said that South Africa "will not tolerate international interference in its affairs".

105. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, it is the Council's duty to use its weight and authority to demand an immediate end to the aggressive actions of the racist South African régime and to protect the sovereignty and independence of African countries. The Soviet Union supports the draft resolution submitted by the non-aligned countries, which contains a strong condemnation of Pretoria's criminal action against Botswana.

106. Mr. GUISSOU (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): The events are so self-explanatory that my delega-

tion can only express its condolences and sympathy to the fraternal Government and people of Botswana.

107. Sooner or later, with or without the blind support that Pretoria continues to receive from its friends, which allows its increasing aggressiveness, the people of South Africa are going to tear down the *apartheid* system in their beloved country. There is a choice to be made, and my country has chosen the peoples over *apartheid*.

108. Such actions put our conscience to the test and force us to consider the question of whether a man is a man, with the same rights and the same duties, wherever he may live on this earth. Do the citizens of Botswana have the right to live in peace, as do the citizens of our countries? We believe the answer to be "Yes". That is why we hope that the Council, after its last two meetings, will now unanimously adopt a clear position in keeping with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, No. 2545.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 1001, No. 14691.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York

00300

90-61439—November 1994—1,925